

Randolph Township Zoning Commission

May 27, 2015

Zoning Commission: Gary Harrison, Paul Hyde, Lori Briggs, Brad Miller, Rich Knapp

Trustees: Sue White

BZA: Chuck Guthier, Betty Siegfert

ZI: Erin Myrla

Present: Fred Huth, Annette Kline, Beth Kline, Dave Goodyear, John Francis, Howard Kline, Todd Peetz, Glen Engelhart, Nancy Engelhart

B. Miller: Opened meeting at 7pm. Todd Peetz spoke about previously proposed changes.

T. Peetz: Brought copies of map changes discussed at last meeting. Presented map changes. Mentioned at last meeting moving TC further north toward Fairground Rd. Stated he didn't think he was directed to do that, but wanted to hear what the Zoning Commission wanted to do.

B. Miller: Need to talk to tax people or residents.

B. Kline: Do the changes increase TC or decrease the size of TC?

T. Peetz: Explained why changes are proposed. There is an increase in acreage in TC.

B. Miller: Still commercial uses in TC.

H. Kline: Not proposing to move TC up to Fairground Rd.? Thinks it would be nice to keep it residential.

B. Kline: Asked for clarification on map key.

T. Peetz: Text amendments. Discussed recommendations. Is there anything ZC would like to add to the conditions of automotive uses? Anything that needs to be changed from what is listed on proposed text amendments? Concerns were buffering, aesthetics. Trying to make sure if automotive uses are a conditional use, the community is still protected.

H. Kline: Still need to meet the zoning, even if automotive uses is allowed.

T. Peetz: It is not a permitted use. Still would need to ask BZA. Try to catch conditions now rather than later.

Audience (unknown): Is there a decision being made tonight?

T. Peetz: No. Perhaps a recommendation to send it to Regional Planning. Regional Planning is recommending body. Map amendments or part may have to go to referendum.

B. Kline: #8 under conditionally permitted uses seems vague.

T. Peetz: Explained that it is referenced in section 600 Conditional Uses. Setbacks, etc. would still follow district. The use would have to follow use requirements.

B. Kline: Still seems vague. Not seeing about the extent of the change that is being made. When does that get clarified?

T. Peetz: Explained requirements.

B. Kline: It doesn't limit size?

T. Peetz: It would go back to the district regulations.

B. Kline: In reality, if they wanted to make business extend to north edge of TC, they could?

T. Peetz: They would have to work within property lines and setback within districts. A lot of times BZA will set more conditions for conditional uses.

B. Kline: Would the plan need to be given in its entirety before the public voted on it? And presented to the public?

T. Peetz: The information is presented to the BZA.

H. Kline: When BZA gives a conditional use do all the zoning restrictions need met?

T. Peetz: These conditions are the minimum. Pre-existing variances still go with the land.

H. Kline: New conditional use, do they still follow current zoning regulations?

T. Peetz: Yes, they still need to meet requirements.

B. Kline: Process, from applicant to ZI and then where?

T. Peetz: ZI would make sure application requirement is met, it would be forwarded to BZA and meeting would be scheduled. Discussed process.

B. Kline: Purpose of today's meeting is to discuss recommendations?

T. Peetz: Yes. Further discussion. The ZC had asked for more information. I put everything on map and written.

B. Kline: When will public be able to see info before final vote?

T. Peetz: ZI office would have them. Began more discussion about proposed text amendments. Asked for questions from ZC.

B. Miller: Suggested GC on the west side of the map be R2 instead of R1 because surrounding area is R2.

T. Peetz: Industrial can't be located within 50' of residential districts. Talked about having residential not being located within 50' of industrial districts. Having a reciprocal requirement. Page 3 on proposed text amendments.

R. Knapp: Are you doubling up on buffering if you do that? Are you adding an additional buffer?

T. Peetz: Explained the idea behind suggesting this. For example, if you move next to an existing airport, and you build 15' from property line, you start to complain. If it's good for industrial, it should be good for residential. It's just a suggestion. Not a buffer on the residential side, just on the industrial side. Recommended adding a height limit on buildings in R1 and R2- 35' is the recommendation.

B. Miller: When you added the GC, all permitted and conditional permitted uses transferred over to TC, correct?

T. Peetz: No.

B. Miller: Everything listed in GC has been addressed in the change, correct?

T. Peetz: No, the district regulations would apply. If the use existed in GC, and not part of TC, if it's vacant property TC would supersede. If you were an existing use in GC, you would be a grandfather use in TC.

Audience (unknown): Assuming it doesn't apply to things that were done against zoning?

T. Peetz: If they're doing things that aren't compliant, they need to comply.

R. Knapp: What are permitted uses in TC?

B. Miller: Gave page number.

B. Miller: Under conditional permitted uses in GC, what we have now, we don't have GC uses in TC.

T. Peetz: Listed what is permitted in NC and GC and TC. Listed conditional uses for GC, TC. They are very similar, but auto sales is not currently allowed in TC. It's only conditional in GC, recommendation is to make it conditional permitted in TC.
Discussion about drive-throughs associated with restaurants.

B. Miller: Make sure conditional permitted uses currently is transferred from GC to TC.

R. Knapp: Maybe you don't need to roll over hotel/motel establishments.

B. Miller: If you did get those establishments, you'd want to keep them in TC, right?

T. Peetz: Is the hotel/motel something you'd want to see in TC?

Audience (unknown): One is going in Rootstown. Really need to think about hotel/motel coming here.

F. Huth: Football Hall of Fame is asking for hotels.

B. Kline: Doesn't see need to merge TC with GC? Initial intent is small business.

T. Peetz: The only thing talking about merging is auto, which would be conditional permitted use. Good points about Rootstown hotel/motel. Thinks there are two proposed there now.

B. Kline: Do both discussions need to happen together?

T. Peetz: This is a living document. Now is a good time to talk about it, but this isn't the end of discussion. Discussed process. Now is perfect time to start framing changes. If the area grows, more opportunities for business, such as restaurants to thrive. Property ownership is all about opportunity. Planning is more about accommodation, sometimes.

B. Kline: That is really proactive rather than reactive.

H. Kline: Asked a question about the proposed map. Shouldn't the proposed Industrial go down to Waterloo Rd.?

S. White: So East is the only company allowed to have Industrial?

T. Peetz: It doesn't mean you can't expand Industrial or that East is the only one allowed to have Industrial. You can't force someone not to buy all of the Industrial land.

S. White: Is that the only place in town we want Industrial?

N. Englehart: Why do we have a trucking company on Waterloo Rd. in residential?

H. Kline: Doesn't see a place to put more Industrial.

S. White: Thinks there are some places on St. Rt. 44 going south.

J. Francis: Someone tried to stop him from an agricultural use. Machine shop on St. Rt. 44 was a restaurant. If you look at R2 on St. Rt. 44, why couldn't that be commercial?

T. Peetz: Asked for clarification on what Mr. Francis was suggesting. Used the map to point out particular areas.

Multiple audience members: Much discussion. Many separate discussion about J. Francis' proposal.

B. Miller: Used map to discuss J. Francis' proposal.

G. Englehart: You're not planning on expanding sewer system?

B. Miller: That's not up to us.

S. White: Discussed and showed on map where the sewer stops.

P. Hyde: Hates to see farmland go to waste.

J. Francis: It's only 80 acres.

P. Hyde: Are you talking about my property?

J. Francis: No. The sewer wasn't supposed to go where it is now. It went everywhere except where it was needed.

B. Kline: Asked for clarification of J. Francis' proposal.

F. Huth: All property on east side of East is supposed to be TC property, right? Why don't we make that R2 get rid of making that TC.

P. Hyde: One lady wasn't happy about it, but she asked about it.

F. Huth: If it's going to be TC, worried about a car lot all the way to Fairground Rd.

B. Kline: Goes back to question I asked earlier. Regarding extent of what auto business would be able to do.

T. Peetz: They would still need to go to BZA. That's why you'd want it as a conditional permitted use rather than permitted use. Discussed procedure. All about enforcement and consistency. Combination of ZI, Trustees, and Prosecutor.

H. Kline: Question about property purchased by Fair Board. Why would the Fair buy that?

B. Miller: It was available, so they bought it.

Multiple discussions

R. Knapp: Asked about specific proposed map change.

T. Peetz: Used map to explain. Regarding east section of TC on Waterloo Rd. surrounded by R1 and R2.

Multiple discussions

B. Miller: Asked about GC v. Industrial.

T. Peetz: Was told by the previous ZI there was a service department there, that's why he didn't make the change.

S. White: What if owner doesn't want proposed change?

T. Peetz: We deal with it one at a time. Invite property owners to meetings to be heard.

B. Kline: Key player is not here. Sarchiones aren't here.

T. Peetz: It's still a discussion phase. Discussed procedure.

H. Kline: The property on St. Rt. 44 south of Bassett. Did it get changed to commercial when East purchased it?

Many discussions regarding Mr. Kline's question.

B. Miller: Get a list of all property owners this would involve.

T. Peetz: Is ZC requesting any new changes?

B. Miller: Would like to invite all property owners.

H. Kline: Some people have misconceptions about TC.

S. White: TC doesn't necessarily mean commercial.

T. Peetz: Will work with Erin to get property owners that may be affected by proposed change.

B. Miller: Do we want to include R2 on St. Rt. 44?

T. Peetz: The houses in front of Fairground would not be included in the change.

Multiple discussions.

T. Peetz: All proposed map amendments will move forward. Will invite property owners (he specified on map, I couldn't see) to next meeting to discuss. Not changing anything yet, just talking. After talking to property owners, it would go to Regional Planning. More procedure discussion. Didn't hear any changes to text amendments, except what B. Miller suggested about uses and the discussion about hotels/motels.

B. Miller: Next meeting is June 24, 2015 at 7:00pm.

R. Knapp: Are we going to have answers about tax implications if we change districts?

S. White: Wouldn't see much difference.

B. Miller: Adjourned meeting at 8:26pm